

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

AD379522

CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

TO: unclassified

FROM: confidential

LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

Approved for public release, distribution
unlimited

FROM:

9

AUTHORITY

OCA via ltr; Sep 19, 1983.; DA, Chief of
Research and Dev. ltr 19 Sep 1983

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

No. 11046
C-1 (1)
-515

In addition to security requirements which apply to this document and must be met, it may be further distributed by the holder only with specific prior approval of the Chief of Research and Development, Dept. of the Army.

CONFIDENTIAL

(9) Staff Memorandum

(6)

FACTORS RELATED TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPECIAL FORCES PERSONNEL (U).

(10) Herbert I. Abelson

(11) 5 August 1954

✓ B

(12) 53P.

Research Team

Harriet S. Beckwitt
Alvin G. Edgell
Lawrence E. Schlesinger

In addition to security requirements which apply to this document and must be met, it may be further distributed by the holder only with specific prior approval of the Chief of Research and Development, Dept. of the Army.

1 The George Washington University
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH OFFICE
operating under contract with
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(73 2-0)

This document contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, U. S. C., Section 793 et seq.
Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.
HumRRO Control No. A-2513.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SUMMARY

Problem

This research was designed to identify differences between the background characteristics, personality traits, interests, and attitudes of effective and ineffective Special Forces personnel, as a first step in the development of techniques for screening volunteers for Special Forces training.

Approach

This study was conducted in two phases. The first was the development and use of a method for classifying the members of the 10th Special Forces Group according to the judgments of other members of the Group of their probable personal effectiveness under operational conditions. The second phase consisted of an assessment of a group of superior and group of inferior personnel, selected on the basis of the findings from the first phase. The instruments used for assessment included some which were available in published form, and some which were constructed especially for this research.

Findings and Preliminary Conclusions

- (1) Many of the differences between the effective and ineffective individuals can be identified and measured.
- (2) The accuracy of preliminary predictions of effectiveness is highest when based on personal history or interest test data.
- (3) The effective man is a mature, responsible individual, less likely than the ineffective man to view his job as a glamorous, exciting occupation. An estimate of past willingness to assume family and community responsibility should be a useful part of assessment procedure.
- (4) As is true elsewhere, the effective man in Special Forces is better able than the ineffective man to cope with his job, his colleagues, and his outside responsibilities.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- (5) In general, effective men express a preference for work which involves initiative, physical activity, and new experiences, and reject work which is routine, detailed, and carried on indoors. Vocational preferences should be incorporated into assessment procedures.
- (6) The effective man more than the ineffective one tends to be aware of his physical (e.g. endurance) and personal (e.g. initiative) abilities and limitations. An estimate of the degree of realism with which a man rates himself should be a part of assessment procedure.
- (7) Within the 10th Special Forces Group, the top two enlisted grades (E-6, E-7) were judged by members of the Group to contain a larger percentage of effective men than do any other grades, enlisted or officer.
- (8) No relationship was found between estimates of effectiveness in Special Forces and numerical grade in Special Forces school.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
Nature of Special Forces.....	1
Problem for This Research.....	2
Scope of Research.....	2
Research Objectives.....	3
Application of Information in This Report.....	4
Plan of Research.....	4

Chapter 2

THE CRITERIA OF SUCCESS

General Considerations.....	6
Development and Use of the Special Forces Criterion...	8
The Evaluation Instrument.....	8
Details of Administration.....	9
Incidental Observations.....	10
Processing of Nominations Booklets.....	11
Analysis of the Nominations Data.....	12
Summary Information.....	12
Were There Enough Nominators to Produce Stable Results.....	13
Special Problems.....	13
Discussion.....	17

CONFIDENTIAL¹

CONFIDENTIAL
TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

Chapter 3
THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	18
Composition of the Test Battery.....	19
The Personal Data Form.....	19
The F-Scale.....	20
The Strong Vocational Interest Blank.....	21
The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory....	21
The Taylor Anxiety Scale.....	22
The Sentence Completion Test.....	22
Details of Administration.....	24

Chapter 4
ANALYSIS OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Introduction.....	26
Personal Data Form, Parts 1 and 2.....	26
F-Scale.....	30
Strong Vocational Interest Blank.....	31
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.....	31
A-Scale.....	33
Sentence Completion.....	33
Special Forces Scoring Keys.....	36
Discussion.....	37

CONFIDENTIAL
ii

CONFIDENTIAL
TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

REFERENCES

	<u>Page</u>
Agency Reports.....	38
Books.....	43
Forms.....	44
Journal Articles.....	45
Unpublished Sources.....	46
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	48
APPENDIX.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

Body of Report

Table

1 Distribution of High and Low Groups by Army Rank...	14
2 Distribution of Number of Nominations Received in High and Low Groups.....	15
3 Number of Nominations Received by Item for Tested and Untested Men.....	16

Appendix

1 Pearson r Correlation Coefficients for Each Criterion Item with Each Other Criterion Item.....	50
2 Pearson r Correlation Coefficients for Six Strong Scales with the Nominations Scores.....	51
3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Critical Ratios for the Differences Between Means of the High and Low Criterion Groups, Based on MMPI Scales.....	52
4 Pearson r Correlation Coefficients of Each Score with Every Other Score and with the Criterion.....	53

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of guerilla operations is as old as war itself, although guerilla tactics and strategy have changed with the changing nature of modern combat. The mission, organization, and preparation of Special Forces units for guerilla-related activity are innovations in the area of unconventional warfare. Never before has the Army provided within its formal peacetime structure for Special Forces type of personnel.

Nature of Special Forces*

In the event of hostilities, Special Forces teams will help to organize, train, supply, advise, and in other ways enhance the effectiveness of friendly forces operating behind enemy lines. The basic operational teams consist of 2 officers and 13 enlisted men, all jump-trained volunteers. Team members reflect a variety of skills considered important for their kind of activity. Each team includes specialists in demolitions, supply, light and heavy weapons, radio operation and maintenance, and care of the wounded and sick. One team will support one guerilla regiment, which may vary in size from a few hundred to a few thousand.

Special Forces district teams will coordinate the operations of guerilla regiments in adjacent areas and provide staff assistance to guerilla leaders. Two or more district teams will report to an area team, whose responsibility is to the unconventional warfare organization at theater headquarters. In wartime, Special Forces activities are integrated into the plan of battle at the discretion of the theater commander.

To facilitate training and administration during non-operational periods, Special Forces teams are organized into detachments, consisting of about 10 teams each. Three or four detachments constitute a battalion, and three or four battalions, a group. The group commander

* Lt. Col. M. J. Waters, Office, Chief of Psychological Warfare, contributed substantially to the material in this section.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -
CONFIDENTIAL

is normally a colonel, whose headquarters includes an "S" staff, as in an infantry-regiment headquarters. The research reported here was conducted with the 10th Special Forces Group when they were in training at Fort Bragg, N. C.

Problem for This Research

Because of the unusual demands of the mission, the problem of choosing the right men for Special Forces is a critical one. The problem is amplified when the operational importance of every man is considered. Furthermore, there are serious difficulties in getting an undesirable man out of an area once he has been dropped. Ideally, the suitability of every team member for this work should be determined on the basis of his past operational accomplishments. Actually, and certainly at first, a man's usefulness is estimated from what is known about his performance during training and from the judgments others make of his personal characteristics.

Within the 10th Special Forces Group there are men who would make an effective contribution to the success of Special Forces missions. There are other men within the group whose contribution to a mission would be less effective. The general problem of this research was to locate some of the differences between the very effective (superior) and less effective (inferior) men within the group by comparing them in many ways. These differences would then be the basis for developing techniques to screen volunteers prior to their acceptance for training in a Special Forces unit.

Scope of Research

After the superior and inferior men have been identified, two important avenues for investigation are open to a research study of this kind. One possibility is to compare the men by finding out what they know and what they can do. This would involve a study of how well they make use of their training. The other possibility is to compare them by studying their backgrounds, personalities, interests, prejudices, and ways of behaving in different situations. Office of Strategic Services (OSS) assessment procedures during World War II (48)* are an

* The numbers in parentheses throughout the text refer to items in the list of references.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

example of this latter kind of study on a large scale. The kinds of information yielded by both types of comparison are needed before a complete judgment can be made of a man's usefulness. A man who is well thought of by his colleagues would be worth little if he did not know his job. Similarly, a man who knows the elements of his job well would be useless if he could not get along with other members of his team and receive their support.

This research was designed to compare the personal history, interests, attitudes, and personality characteristics of superior and inferior Special Forces personnel; only minimal attention was given to job proficiency and knowledge at this time. The factors which are least changed by training were chosen for emphasis because:

- (1) This research is the basis for developing techniques to screen men before they are accepted for training. How well a man can do his job can only be determined after training.
- (2) A man of average intelligence can be taught the skills he will need for his job, but he cannot as easily be taught to tolerate discomfort, or to be patient when necessary, or to refrain from bragging about his exploits.

Research Objectives

The research has been oriented about four major objectives, listed in the order in which they were investigated:

- (1) To develop a method for separating Special Forces personnel into superior, in-between, and inferior groups according to judgments of their probable success in combat missions.
- (2) To identify the personality traits, interests, attitudes, and personal history characteristics of these personnel which are related to their probable success or failure.
- (3) To develop an instrument which can be used as a part of the procedure for screening volunteers for Special Forces training.
- (4) To suggest the scope and content of further research in the selection of Special Forces personnel.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

This report does not contain a selection instrument; it contains the basis for developing such an instrument. With additional research to corroborate and extend the present findings, a usable technique should emerge from the information supplied here.

Research should continue through an additional phase to provide an operational instrument which may be used to screen volunteers for Special Forces and assure maximum efficiency in the selection of such personnel. A manual of administration and scoring procedures will be developed for use in conjunction with the screening technique. Such a manual will contain the kind of information that would permit any competent non-commissioned officer to use the screening technique correctly.

Application of Information in This Report

If research were to terminate at this point, the information already obtained would be useful to Special Forces, although such information would be incomplete. For example, some of the findings have already been presented to individuals concerned with selection for their consideration in making plans. The method developed for separating personnel into superior and inferior categories may be adapted by itself as an assessment technique. Personality and interest test items reported here reveal sensitive areas for probing in assessing an individual or unit. Items of personal history which distinguish between superior and inferior personnel constitute a partial schedule for interviewing prospective trainees. Should changes in doctrine suggest a revision of the Army Special Regulation pertaining to recruitment of Special Forces personnel,* portions of this report might be helpful in formulating requirements for admission.

Plan of Research

The study reported here was conducted in two phases. The purpose of the first phase was to separate members of the 10th Special Forces Group into categories of personal effectiveness on the basis of judgments by their fellow members. The second phase consisted of using a number of measuring instruments on selected individuals in the superior and inferior categories. A four week

* SR 600-160-10, Volunteers for Special Forces Units, April 1952.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

interval separated the data-collecting portions of the two phases, which are reported separately in the chapters that follow. A third phase is needed to corroborate and extend the usefulness of the techniques reported here, by trying them out on a new group of men. This phase is being planned for initiation as soon as there are enough subjects available who did not participate in the current research. In addition, the third phase will be concerned with exploring some of the underlying reasons for the responses of the superior and inferior groups. Finally, the third phase will include the development of test administration and scoring techniques to aid in maximizing the potential operational value of the findings in this report.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHAPTER 2

THE CRITERIA OF SUCCESS

General Considerations

A primary objective of this study - identifying differences between superior and inferior Special Forces personnel - was preceded by a need to know who was superior and who was inferior. Of the many ways of judging the worth of these men, the ideal is to base such judgment on their performance in combat. The ideal way can only rarely be used, however, even in time of hostilities. If men could be studied during combat, the estimates of a man's value would still depend on the opinions of other people. When questioned, men who have participated in guerilla activities differ markedly with respect to their opinions of former teammates. Special Forces missions are a team activity, and it would often be difficult to single out any individual as the one responsible for the success or failure of an operation.

Judgments of performance during maneuvers of field problems are a substitute for judgments made during actual operations. Maneuvers, however, have their disadvantages. First, the emphasis is more on evaluating units than evaluating individuals. When the performance of individuals is rated at all, it is usually on the basis of technical competence, a factor of only minimal concern to this research. Second, maneuvers last too short a time to permit the kinds of observations demanded by this study. Observation of performance during maneuvers is most rewarding when research has passed the exploratory stage, and the testing of new assumptions yielded by earlier results is likely to lead to increasingly definitive findings.

Some consideration was given to the use of grades from Special Forces School or scores on portions of the Army Training Program. These were discarded because they emphasized knowledge, a factor of secondary importance to this study. In addition, there seemed to be doubt in the Special Forces Department at Fort Bragg, N.C., as to whether school grades were any index of a man's value in the field. This feeling was partially substantiated in this research when the fact was established that no relationship existed between school grades and judged

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

success in Special Forces.*

The methods of judging men which had immediately suggested themselves (performance in combat, performance during maneuvers, school grades) were thus explored and discarded for purposes of this study. In the search for other methods of evaluation, it was desirable that as many of the following requirements as possible be fulfilled:

Judgments of a man's worth should be

- (1) Based on observations over a long period of time
- (2) Concerned with how well the man would perform in combat
- (3) Made only by those people who might someday have to entrust their lives to the man they are judging
- (4) Agreed upon by several people, and not dependent upon the whim of one individual who may know the man through an unrepresentative encounter
- (5) Made by people who see him in many different lights: his superiors, peers, and subordinates

An evaluation based on these requirements would probably be the most nearly valid estimate of an individual. Whether these factors can actually be incorporated into an evaluation system depends on the nature of the evaluating group and the technique used. Certain characteristics of the Special Forces Group fit well with the requirements. Special Forces personnel are continuously alerted to the importance of forming correct impressions of the capabilities and weaknesses of those with whom they work. Many of the men in the group studied had known each other for longer than six months; the sample of men finally used for this research was drawn mainly from those detachments which had lived together and been in training the longest period of time.

The evaluation technique which was developed satisfied all the requirements. It was an adaptation of a nominations system, but was especially constructed and pretested for use with Special Forces personnel. The development of the technique is discussed in the next section.

* A correlation coefficient was computed between grades in Special Forces School and the criterion of success described in this chapter. Pearson r was - .05, which may be interpreted as not demonstrating a relationship.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Development and Use of the Special Forces Criterion

The Evaluation Instrument. Since no useful judgment of a man can be made without some bases, the first step in developing an evaluation technique is to identify factors which the evaluators can use as yardsticks. These yardsticks were developed from a number of interviews with personnel at Army posts and agencies who had had wartime experience in guerilla operations.* The interviews were oriented about the characteristics of successful Special Forces personnel. From these discussions, five factors related to success were identified:

- (1) Technical competence and skill
- (2) Dependability - staying on the job no matter how difficult or threatening the situation
- (3) Initiative - taking advantage of changing situations without orders or supervision
- (4) Patience - enduring periods of forced inactivity without becoming restless or careless
- (5) Representativeness - looking and acting in a way approved by other Special Forces personnel

Each of these factors was phrased to relate it to a combat situation and written in the form of a nominations question. After pretesting at the Special Forces Department, the five questions were made the substance of a printed booklet, the Personal Judgment Form.** Each question appeared on a left-hand page, with a heavy arrow indicating the portion of the right-hand page to be used for nominations. As a sample, the dependability item is repeated, exactly as it appeared in the booklet:

* Sources of interviewees included the Office, Chief of Army Field Forces; Office, Chief of Psychological Warfare; the Psychological Warfare Center, Fort Bragg, N.C.; and the Human Resources Research Office.

** A copy of this booklet is included in the technical appendices to this report, available on request from the Human Resources Research Office.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

If you were going on a dangerous and important mission, which depended on the team members staying on the job no matter how difficult and dangerous conditions became, who would you want to take with you? Think of at least three men you would pick, and print their names and ranks in the first block of lines on the next page.

Now think of at least three men you would not want to take with you because their ability to stick to it under difficult and dangerous conditions does not measure up to what you want from your team. Print these names and ranks on the second block of lines on the next page.

Lastly, think of two or three men you would not choose, but would not object to if they came along. Print these names and ranks in the third block of lines on the next page.

The third statement was included with every question even though the information from it would not be particularly useful. Its function was to give the men an opportunity to nominate personal friends who were not good enough to be listed as superior, but whose exclusion would have been dissatisfying to the evaluator.

Details of Administration. During April 1953, arrangements were made at the Psychological Warfare Center, Fort Bragg, N.C., to have the 10th Special Forces Group participate in the nominations phase of the research. It was requested that about 400 officers and enlisted men (somewhat less than one-third of the group) from the most experienced detachments be asked to fill out the nominations booklet. During the period 11-15 May 1953 nominations booklets were filled out by 378 of the Special Forces personnel, including 67 officers. Subjects, in groups of 25 or less, reported at designated times to a classroom building where they were assigned by HumRRO proctors to alternate seats in each row. One hour was allotted to each administration, including about 20 minutes of orientation. Subjects usually finished within the time allowed.

All orientations were conducted by the author, whose preliminary remarks were designed to secure cooperation and to stress the anonymity aspects of the research. The guarantees that answers would be used only for

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

research purposes were again stated in the test booklet where they were amplified in two ways: (1) personal - "No one in the Army but yourself will ever see what you write or have any record of what is written in these booklets" and (2) group - "The information you give us will never be used in any way on members of the 10th Special Forces Group." Later conversation with subjects indicated that they believed these promises. The men did not identify themselves anywhere in the booklets.

During the orientation period, the subjects were asked to open the test booklets and read the first two pages - a short indoctrination and a set of rules to clarify and control the nominating procedure. The rules were read aloud as the subjects read silently. A summary of the rules appeared on a printed chart which was posted when the subjects began to write.

The rules for nominations included these topics (but not in this form):

- (1) Eligibility. Any jump-trained member of the 10th Special Forces Group, regardless of rank or unit, whether or not physically present with the group at this time, was eligible for nomination.
- (2) Rank. All men in the group were to be considered as having the same military rank.
- (3) Repetition. It was permissible to repeat names, but better to spread nominations among as many individuals as possible.

The last part of the orientation consisted of reading aloud and discussing each of the questions. Subjects were then instructed to begin filling out the booklets.

Incidental Observations. Informal interviews were purposely carried on with some subjects following the administration of the booklets. These conversations provided opportunities for probing the subjects' attitudes toward the test period, and also for discovering some of their feelings toward Special Forces and the Army. The sample so interviewed was not representative; usually the subjects were the men who had finished first as well as men who were willing to talk.

Some of the impressions which the research team received from these interviews were: (1) as was observed

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

during the testing sessions, the men entered into the task of filling out nominations booklets in a serious, purposeful way with a recognition of the importance of the job; (2) the noncommissioned officers, especially grades E-6 and E-7, seemed to be considerably above average in both intelligence and motivation; (3) most of the expressed criticism of the 10th Group was a reflection of conditions in the Army in general rather than in Special Forces.

Processing of Nominations Booklets. With the aid of rosters provided by the 10th Group and tally sheets devised at HunRRO, the names in the nominations books were transferred onto sheets and later onto file cards for each individual.

Originally, it was expected that for each individual, several scores could be extracted from the data, each score being based on responses to an item or combination of items. This idea was discarded when the items proved to be highly related.* It was finally decided that individuals would be assigned to the superior or inferior group if their nominations scores were derived within the meaning of the following specifications:

- (1) When a man received at least five votes, all high or low, for any one question or combination of questions, he was assigned to the appropriate group. For purposes of this assignment, the in-between category was discarded and only the high and low categories used. The extremes of this minimum requisite would be five nominators, each voting once for the subject, or one nominator voting five times for the subject, once for each item. In actuality, each subject in the superior and inferior groups received two votes for at least one of the items, so neither of these contingencies is represented in the sample.

* See Appendix, Table 1, for relevant data. The "halo effect" is one explanation of this high relationship among items. That is, that the nominators were influenced less by the instructions for each item than they were by some marked characteristic(s) of the men they were judging.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- (2) If an individual received votes on more than one item (which happened in all but a few cases), the direction of nominations (high or low) for all items had to be the same.
- (3) When the sum of the nominations for an individual was nine or less, all had to be either high or low. When there were a total of 10 nominations, a score of nine high and one low, or one high and nine low was acceptable. When a subject received 11 or more nominations, he was identified as superior or inferior if at least 80 per cent of the nominations were either high or low, respectively.

When these rules were applied, 280 men qualified for the criterion group. Of these, 153 were judged superior and 127 inferior. Each of the 280 men was assigned a nominations score which was used in later analyses of the data.*

Analyses of the Nominations Data

Summary Information. The sample of 378 members of the 10th Special Forces Group nominated 1,188 group members one or more times for a total of 15,467 nominations. There was a decrease in the total number of nominations for each successive item in the booklets, although the percentage of this total number accounted for by the men who qualified remained relatively constant at about 47 per cent. Almost 1,500 more votes were tallied in the superior category than in the inferior category. Other descriptive information follows:

- (1) The 280 men who qualified received almost half (47.3%) of all the nominations, but comprise less than one-fourth (23.6%) of all the individuals nominated (1,188).
- (2) Members of the superior and inferior groups received an average of twice as many nominations as the average number of nominations for all individuals mentioned (26 to 13).

* The nominations score consisted of the algebraic sum of the high (plus) and low (minus) votes, plus 75. Adding 75 to each score was done to facilitate IBM machine operations, and did not change the relative position of any of the men in the sample.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- (3) The lowest man in the inferior group received over 80 votes against him. The highest man in the superior group received more than 125 votes for him.

Were There Enough Nominators to Produce Stable Results? The amount of confidence that can be placed in the nominations scores depends on the answer to this question. It was not possible to predict the size of the group of nominators needed to be representative of the entire Special Forces Group. In theory, one way to handle this problem would be to tabulate nominations booklets in sets of 100 at a time. If there were more than minor differences between the results of the first two sets, these sets would be combined into a sample of 200 booklets, and in turn compared with the results from another 100 booklets. The process would continue until the nominations became stable, i.e., adding new booklets would not change the relative positions of more than a small fraction of the men in the high and low groups.

A practical adaptation of this method was made by separating the nominators into two groups, and finding out the degree to which the nominations made by one group agreed with those made by the other group. An appropriate statistical analysis was used to determine the amount of agreement between the two sets of nominators.* The results of this analysis show a high agreement, and indicate that the nominations are entirely satisfactory for continued use.

Special Problems. Information related to three topics of interest was analyzed out of the nominations data. The three topics, phrased as questions, are these:

- (1) Were the men with the higher rank more likely to be found in the superior group, and the men with lower rank in the inferior group?

* The analysis consisted of (1) dividing the 378 completed nominations booklets into two groups, odd-numbered and even-numbered in order of appearance; (2) determining a new nominations score from each set of booklets for each member of the high and low groups; and (3) computing a correlation coefficient for the two sets of scores so obtained. Pearson r_s (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula) was + .94.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- (2) Did the men in the superior group receive more nominations than the men in the inferior group?
- (3) Was there anything unusual about the nominations scores of the men who did not show up for the testing later on, in contrast with the scores of men who did show up for testing later on?

The same kind of analysis technique was appropriate to all of these topics.*

Data on rank and nominations scores are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH AND LOW GROUPS BY ARMY RANK

Group	Pvt-2,Pfc	Cpl,Sgt	SFC,M/Sgt	Officers	Total
High	13	16	79	45	153
Low	58	27	20	22	127
Total	71	43	99	67	280

Analysis of these data shows large differences between the distributions of rank for each nominations group.** It is not difficult to find explanations for these differences. An obvious reason is that more competent men would have higher rank. This is especially true in noncommissioned officer grades, since there is only moderate restriction in Special Forces on rank distribution for enlisted personnel. Table 1 shows that officers are more evenly divided between the high and low groups than are the top NCO grades, which are predominantly in the high group. This fact may possibly be explained in either of two ways: (1) The nominators were able to make better judgments of NCOs because officers were not as well known (in this case, if the

* Chi square.

** Chi square computed for Table 1 is 72.60, 3 degrees of freedom. The probability is less than 1 in 1,000 that a chi square of that size can occur by chance.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

nominators knew the officers as well as they knew their NCOs more officers might have been in the high group) or (2) the sergeants first class and master sergeants are superior to any other men in the Special Forces Group.

Table 2 shows the relation between number of votes received and nominations group.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS RECEIVED IN HIGH AND LOW GROUPS

Group	Number of Nominations					Total
	5-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Over 40	
High	16	45	35	18	39	153
Low	33	45	25	15	9	127
Total	49	90	60	33	48	280

Analysis of these data reveals a clear tendency for individuals who received few votes to be in the low group and for those who received many votes to be in the high group.* It is interesting to note that this tendency is most marked in the extreme categories where each man had under 11 or over 40 votes. The middle three categories contain well over half the cases, approximately equally divided between the high and low groups. Three inferences may be drawn from these findings (few votes, low group; many votes, high group): (1) It is easier for a nominator to identify a superior man than an inferior man, (2) Nominators are more reluctant to rate a man low than to rate him high, (3) Of the two nominations groups, high and low, the scores in the high group are more consistent because more people agree on the scores in the high group.

By the end of the week devoted to the testing program,** 215 of the original group of 280 had participated.

* Chi square computed for Table 2 is 24.38, 4 degrees of freedom. The probability is less than 1 in 1,000 that a chi square of that size can occur by chance.

** Phase II of this research, see Chapter 3.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Of those who did not report for testing, about half were on leave or assigned temporary duty away from the Special Forces Group. Others who did not report had been separated from the Army or transferred out of Special Forces between the administration of the nominations booklet and the later testing period. Although physical absence from Special Forces seemed to account for most of the subjects who did not report for testing, it still seemed important to discover whether those who did not report were different in any other way from those who did. If those who did not report were different, the research results might be affected by their absence. The men who reported were compared with the men who did not report by means of the only research information available for both groups: the number of votes received for each item. Table 3 contains this information.

Table 3

NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS RECEIVED BY ITEM FOR THE
TESTED AND UNTESTED MEN^a

Group	Item					Total
	Skill	Dependability	Initiative	Patience	Representativeness	
Tested	1306	1127	1135	1005	1129	5702
Untested	360	332	285	270	363	1610
Total	1666	1459	1420	1275	1492	7312

^a In both the tested and untested groups, the superior and inferior men are combined.

While examining this table, one should remember that the discrepancy in votes between the tested and untested groups is a function of the size of each group. The votes in the tested group represent 215 men; those in the untested group represent 65 men. Analysis of the data in Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference between the tested and untested men when the size of each group is taken into account.* As far as is known,

* Chi square for Table 3 is 8.92, 4 degrees of freedom. The probability is greater than 5 in 100 that a chi square of that size can occur by chance.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

the additional information which the untested group might have supplied would not affect the research findings reported in Chapter 4.

Discussion

This chapter has described the development of a method for identifying the superior and inferior members of the 10th Special Forces Group. The same method could be used on any Special Forces unit. Its use, or the use of another method for the same purpose, is a necessary preliminary in this kind of research. Only after the superior and inferior members of the group have been identified can research attention be turned to the reasons for the differences between them. The application of this method is basic to the chapters that follow. The next chapter is concerned with the administration of a battery of instruments to individuals judged superior and inferior. Chapter 4 is largely a presentation and discussion of the ways in which these two groups differ.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Chapter 3

THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Introduction

One of the difficult and time-consuming aspects of planning the research was selecting or constructing the instruments which were to be administered to the sample. The problem was to assemble a battery of instruments which would yield the maximum amount of information and which could be administered during a relatively limited period of time. The Psychological Warfare Center and the 10th Special Forces Group made available a full working day of each individual selected for processing. No request was made for additional time. More than one day per subject would have seriously disrupted the activities of the Group.

The objectives of the research and the exploratory nature of the study were important factors in determining the selection of instruments for administration. Because the kinds of variables which would discriminate between the superior and inferior groups could not be predicted, only those instruments or items which assess a wide range of personality, interest, attitude, and personal-history data were considered. No test was included unless a hypothesis could be formulated to explain why the test might be a useful predictor. Clues for hypotheses were obtained from related research studies (15, 17, 27, 29, 31, 36, 48, 77), interviews with former OSS personnel, and "hunches" developed by those engaged in the research.

As a first step, a survey was made of published, standardized tests. From these, tests which satisfied the requirements were selected for use. In some cases, tests were used which had been constructed for other purposes, but which were still in the experimental stage and not yet standardized. Appropriate instruments were constructed specifically for parts of this research where none were already available. The following instruments were used:*

* Copies of the first, second, and fifth instruments, adapted specifically for this research, are included in the technical appendices to this report, available on request from the Human Resources Research Office. The third, fourth, and sixth are published tests.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- (1) Personal Data Form, Parts 1 and 2
(two booklets)
- (2) F-Scale
- (3) Strong Vocational Interest Blank
for Men (SVIB)
- (4) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality
Inventory (MMPI)
- (5) Taylor Anxiety Scale (forced choice
form developed at HumRRO)
- (6) Miahle-Holsopple Sentence Completion
Test

Each of the instruments is described in the following sections, together with reasons for its inclusion.

Composition of the Test Battery

The Personal Data Form, Parts 1 and 2, consists of two printed booklets containing mainly biographical-type items. It was constructed at HumRRO specifically for this research. There are numerous instances of the successful use of biographical information to predict success on a job (1, 25, 35, 36, 48, 75, 82). Underlying all such instruments is the assumption of a relationship between an individual's past experience and his present behavior. Even such a factor as where a person was born and reared may be important; the wide regional differences in climate, population density, employment opportunities, quality of schooling, and customs limit the kinds of things a person can learn and can do.

The problem of which personal-history items to use was partially solved by surveying other studies which included biographical information questions. Approximately 80 per cent of the personal-history items used in this research were adaptations of questions which had appeared in OSS, Counter Intelligence Corps, Marine Corps Officer Candidate School, and Army OCS studies (48, 17, 35, 29 respectively).* Attitude questions were largely adapted from Volume IV of Studies in Social Psychology in World War II (52).** Most of the items which were taken from

* Acknowledgement is made to the Personnel Research Branch, Personnel Research and Procedures Division, TAGO, and the Office of Naval Research for permission to use materials appearing in their publications.

** Acknowledgement is made to the Princeton University Press for permission to use materials from Samuel A. Stouffer et al., Measurement and Prediction.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

published reports had already been found useful in distinguishing between successful and unsuccessful individuals in jobs related to the type of work done by Special Forces.

The first booklet of the Personal Data Form contained six categories of biographical information: general, childhood and adolescence, formal education, social and recreational activities, vocational experience, and military record. The items in the second booklet were related to parents, spouse and family, attitudes toward Army and job, and self rating questions.

No time limit was set for administration of either booklet of the Personal Data Form. Most of the subjects tested required less than an hour for Part 1 and less than 50 minutes for Part 2.

The source of the F-Scale is The Authoritarian Personality (37)*, a book of research studies which, in part, presumes to explore the dynamics of prejudice as related to personality type. The F-Scale is more than a measure of prejudice. It is a measure of authoritarianism. Often the symptoms of authoritarianism are an adherence to a conventional and inflexible interpretation of the environment - a need to fit the experiences of life into neat categories - and an uncritical loyalty to the desires of one's superiors (parents, teachers, employers, officers) coupled with a demand for similar treatment from those considered to be subordinates. The prejudice aspect of authoritarianism fits into this description insofar as an individual who has a prejudice against a group tends to put all members of that group in one category, which makes it easy to explain their behavior. For example, to one with anti-Semitic attitudes, anything that any Jew does might be traced to a desire for money. Those who are prejudiced against Negroes might attribute the behavior of any Negro to stupidity.

The F-Scale was included in the test battery as a partial test of the hypothesis that, within Special Forces, individuals who perform on the job in an authoritarian fashion are less likely to be judged superior than those whose job behavior is non-authoritarian. For administrative efficiency, the 30 items of the F-Scale were included in Part 2 of the Personal Data Form as a section separate in format, instructions, and method of response.

* Acknowledgement is made to the American Jewish Committee for permission to use materials from T. W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

There is no time limit for administration of the F-Scale. If it were administered alone (i.e., separately from the booklet in which it appeared), most subjects would probably finish within 15 minutes.

The Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men (SVIB) contains 400 items oriented largely about preferences for, and activities related to, jobs and hobbies. For example, one section lists a number of job titles such as criminal lawyer, foreign correspondent, bookkeeper, and the subject is supposed to answer for each one whether he thinks he would like that kind of work, would be indifferent to it, or would dislike it. The assumptions that underlie an interest inventory in the test battery are that a man's interests (1) reflect his past experience and (2) are related to his motivation for, and skill on, the job.

The SVIB was selected from the available interest inventories because the wide range of its items fitted in with the exploratory nature of the research, and because there is far more normative information for the SVIB than for any other interest blank. Weighted scoring keys are provided for more than 50 occupations. Each scoring key is constructed from the unique pattern of responses to the SVIB of successful members of an occupation, tabulated against responses of individuals engaged in a combination of other occupations. Therefore, an individual's score for an occupation group reflects how closely his interest patterns resemble those of successful members of that group.

In addition to the keys for occupations, other scoring keys have been developed for the SVIB. These keys include measures of occupational level, specialization level, interest maturity, and degree of masculinity-femininity of interests.

There is no time limit for administration. Most subjects finished within an hour.

The group form of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is generally recognized as the most comprehensive of all paper-and-pencil personality instruments. The clinical scales which have been developed for assessing personality characteristics are constantly used with normal people. One assumption underlying the use of the MMPI for this kind of research is its value for distinguishing tendencies toward personality deviations which may show up in one or more of the scale scores. Another assumption, specific to this study, is that the superior group is more free than the

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

inferior group of the limitations in thought and action which are common to neurotically predisposed individuals.

The great variety of items and scoring keys was a prime consideration in including the MMPI in the battery. The 566 individual items and the scales derived from them may themselves be analyzed to determine whether they distinguish between the criterion groups. In addition, the large amount of statistical information from MMPI scales for civilian and Army groups might sometime be used to compare the Special Forces sample with other samples.

There is no time limit for administration. Most subjects finished within 90 minutes.

The Taylor Anxiety Scale (A-Scale) (87) was included in the battery as a check on the assumption that men with many symptoms of chronic fear reactions will tend to be judged poor risks for Special Forces operations. The A-Scale is a measure of manifest anxiety (chronic fear reactions) and ranks individuals from those with many symptoms of manifest anxiety to those with few or no symptoms. Symptoms include complaints which, when they exist alone, bear no relation to the purpose of the A-Scale: headache, weak spells, dizziness, nausea, excess sweating, and similar physical ills. Combinations of these symptoms over a period of time, however, are a reflection of anxiety. Even though green troops preparing for combat exhibit many of the symptoms, their anxiety is due to the situation they are in and is not a lasting form of adjustment. The A-Scale would not be a good test to use in this case because it is not intended to reveal short-term anxiety.

A forced-choice form (58) of the A-Scale was constructed by the Training Methods Division of HumRRO for use with Army personnel (90). An advantage of the forced-choice form is that the test subjects find it difficult to make themselves appear in a better light. A disadvantage is that subjects with low Aptitude Area I scores might have difficulty in understanding how to follow directions.

There is no time limit for administration. Most subjects finished within 45 minutes.

The Miahle-Holsopple Sentence Completion test (89) was the last of the tests included in the battery. This is another kind of personality measure and consists of 73 sentence openings which the subject is to complete in any way he chooses. For example, here are the first

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

three openings:

1. CHILDREN ARE USUALLY CERTAIN THAT
2. PEOPLE ARE PRAISED WHEN
3. A LARGE CROWD

An instrument of this kind was needed for two reasons. First, all but a few of the questions in the tests discussed previously are of a multiple-choice or true-false variety. The subjects are limited to choosing one or more alternative from those presented with each question. Even though the range of alternatives was often large and permitted considerable freedom of expression, this freedom was inevitably sacrificed at times for efficiency of administration. This means that occasional responses which some people might have checked did not appear in the test booklets. It was therefore decided that at least one of the tests in the battery should permit as much freedom of response as possible within the limits of the testing program.

The second reason for including this instrument is for what it measures and the way it measures. The Sentence Completion test is one kind of personality inventory in which the hopes, fears, ambitions, attitudes, and daydreams of the individual can be deduced from the way he responds in a relatively free situation. For example, the following responses actually made by members of the high and low criterion groups show how differently people react to the sentence openings:

A PERSON IS MOST HELPLESS WHEN asleep (high)
A PERSON IS MOST HELPLESS WHEN he is without
confidence in himself (low)

TO AVOID A FIGHT ONE MUST be diplomatic (high)
TO AVOID A FIGHT ONE MUST run (low)

Unless a person is a trained psychologist, the Sentence Completion test will probably catch him off guard. The directions are so noncommittal and the sentence openings so innocuous as to effectively mask the purpose of the task. Thus, some individuals who might have been cautious when answering questions on the preceding tests, lest they disclose something undesirable about themselves, are more likely to relax when filling out this one.

The Sentence Completion test therefore was included to (1) help fill the gaps in personality description, (2) check against misleading information on other instruments, and (3) provide a source of hypotheses about

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Special Forces which might not have otherwise come to light.

Details of Administration

The battery of tests was administered at Fort Bragg to 215 members of the high and low groups during the second data-collecting period, 8-12 June 1953. Ten days in advance of the scheduled dates, an alphabetical roster of the men wanted for testing was sent to the Psychological Warfare Center. Special Forces personnel presumably knew that this roster was related to the nominations task of three weeks before, but did not know that the names represented only the men judged superior or inferior. To preserve the secrecy guaranteed those who participated in the nominations, the roster was identified as a cross section of the group. This designation seemed satisfactory to the individuals concerned.

The instruments were administered during a four-day period starting 9 June. Two classroom buildings were reserved for each day, with a HumRRO test administrator and a HumRRO proctor assigned to each classroom. The subjects reported in a group at 0730 hours for the entire day, and were arranged in alternate seats in each row. Officers and enlisted men were tested together. Many of the subjects had participated in the nominations phase the previous month, but for the benefit of those who had not, the orientation included a re-explanation of the general purpose of the research. The schedule was outlined on the board, and each test was separately explained before work on it started. In order to check restlessness due to unoccupied time, the two booklets of the Personal Data Form were used to take up the time slack. There was no time limit for filling these out. One booklet was distributed at the beginning of each half-day session. After a short work period, subjects were started on another test. For the rest of the half day, the Personal Data Forms were retained, to be finished during spare minutes between tests.

The testing schedule was approximately as follows:

0730-0740	Seating of subjects
0740-0750	Orientation and discussion of day's work
0750-0840	Administration: Personal Data Form, Part 1
0840-0850	Break
0850-1000	Administration: Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men
1000-1020	Break (coffee available)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

1020-1120 Administration: Taylor Anxiety Scale
(forced-choice form)
1120-1145 Completion of Personal Data Form, Part 1
1145-1245 Lunch
1245-1315 Administration: Personal Data Form,
Part 2
1315-1445 Administration: Minnesota Multiphasic
Personality Inventory
1445-1500 Break
1500-1600 Administration: Sentence Completion test
1600-1630 Completion of Personal Data Form, Part 2

Test administrators and proctors agreed that throughout the day subjects displayed high motivation and followed instructions well. No subject objected to any part of the program. Many of them said later that they had learned much about themselves during the process of taking the tests. One indication that the test subjects commented favorably on their experience when they returned to the Special Forces Group was that a number of personnel who were not included in the testing roster asked if they could take the tests, even on their own time.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Introduction

The analysis was devoted to finding as many ways as possible to distinguish the superior from the inferior men within the Special Forces sample. This kind of procedure is an important step in the evolution of a selection program, since it is the basis for developing techniques which will identify potentially superior and potentially inferior individuals for Special Forces duty.

In the analyses discussed in the following sections, scoring keys which accompanied the instruments were used, if available. In other cases each test item was processed separately. Often both ways were tried.

Personal Data Form, Parts 1 and 2.* As these questionnaires were constructed specifically for this research, no scoring keys were available. Each item was statistically treated** to determine whether the difference in responses between the high and low men was great enough to warrant using the item.*** Of the 417 items analyzed,

* The analysis of the F-Scale items, included with the Personal Data Form, is described in the following section.

** The statistic used for this instrument, and also for the F-Scale, MMPI, and SVIB, was chi square. In all cases, an item was accepted only if the probability was less than 5 in 100 that the chi square associated with the item could occur by chance, and therefore some factors other than chance could be assumed as effective in producing differences between the superior and inferior groups on these items.

*** For each instrument, lists of items which distinguish satisfactorily between the superior and inferior groups are included in the technical appendices to this report, available on request from the Human Resources Research Office.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

51 were acceptable, and these are the basis for the verbal sketches presented in this section.

On the basis of the personal-history data, verbal sketches were prepared of the typically superior man and the typically inferior one. These descriptions are ideal in the sense that no real person fits them. In actual fact, each of the superior men (those with high criterion scores) made some responses which turn up in the inferior category, and each of the inferior men (those with low criterion scores) made some responses like the typically superior man.

Before these descriptions are presented, it may be well to indicate how they were prepared. As an example, so many of the men in the superior group said that they had played varsity football, and so few of the men in the inferior group made this response, that it was possible to list participation in varsity football as a characteristic of the superior man. Even though playing football was characteristic of one group and not of the other, too much importance cannot be attributed to one question in the screening because the answer represents such a small fraction of the individual's experience and behavior. But with every different kind of question found that separates the high from the low men, the probability of being able to identify the right type of man for Special Forces is increased. Implicit in this procedure is the assumption that the kind of men who are desired are like the best men now in Special Forces (since these were the men picked for the superior group by their co-workers). And if Special Forces accepted only those men who are like the best men already in Special Forces, there is good reason to believe that the caliber of personnel would be improved.

It should be noted that no cause-effect relationship is implied in the descriptions, although such a relationship may be possible. For example, a man is not inferior because he is under 23, implying that once he becomes 23, he will attain the superior category. On the other hand, as a man grows older he gains experience. To that extent, age may be an important adjunct of a superior rating, but not itself a determiner of such a rating.

In scanning the sketches, it may be seen that a number of items are related to each other. For example, rank, marital status, and number of Army schools attended are all related to the age factor; a man has to live for a while before these things happen to him.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

**THE TYPICALLY SUPERIOR
SPECIAL FORCES MAN**

**THE TYPICALLY INFERIOR
SPECIAL FORCES MAN**

In General

Is at least 23 years old
Is married
Has one or more dependents
Was born in Northeast, South-
west, or Pacific states

Is under 23 years old
Is single
Has no dependents
Was born in Southeast or
South Central states

As a Youngster

Was brought up in one geograph-
ical area
Had no periods of extended
illness
Remembers himself as a good
fighter
Either studied or played alone
or at a friend's home
Remembers he was not afraid
of thoughts of death
Said he was punished about
the right number of times

Belonged to a family which
moved once in 4 or 5
years or more often
Had at least one period of
illness lasting two
months or more
Is undecided as to whether
or not he was a good
fighter
Studied or played with
friends who came to his
home
Remembers being frightened
a little or a lot by
thoughts of death
Said he was not punished
often enough

Education

Had above average grades in
grammar school
Attended high school
Never stayed back a grade in
grammar or high school
Lists geography and history
as his best-liked subjects
in high school
While in high school or if he
went to college, participated
in intramural and varsity
athletics
Held office in a varsity athlet-
ic group
Played varsity football

Had average or below aver-
age grades in grammar
school
Did not attend high school
Stayed back one or more
grades because of ill-
ness, trouble with sub-
ject matter, or other
reason
If attended high school,
does not list geography
and history as best
liked
Did not participate in
sports

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

**THE TYPICALLY SUPERIOR
SPECIAL FORCES MAN**

**THE TYPICALLY INFERIOR
SPECIAL FORCES MAN**

The Army

Is most likely to hold the rank of sergeant first class, master sergeant, captain, or major
Feels himself responsible for choice of career (rather than parents, teachers, or others)
Has had at least three months combat experience
Attended three or more Army schools
Has been in airborne units for more than 12 months
Said he is usually happy in his work

Is most likely to hold the rank of private second class, corporal, or sergeant
Reports he has not yet chosen a career
Has had no combat experience
Attended either one Army school or none
Has been in airborne units under 12 months
Said he is always happy in his work

Personal and Social

Pays premiums on more than just G.I. insurance
Enjoys reading adventure books
Dislikes comic books
Knows how to dance
Enjoys drinking (hard liquor)
Enjoys getting "high" occasionally or frequently
Reports a satisfactory amount of sex relations

Does not have extra insurance of any kind
Has no preference for adventure books
Enjoys comic books
Does not know how to dance
Does not enjoy drinking
Has never been "high"
Reports no sex relations or did not answer these questions

How He Rates Himself

Agility: superior or very superior	Average or below average
Endurance: superior or very superior	Average or below average
Skill, dependability, initiative: superior or very superior	Average
Guesses he will stand up <u>very</u> well under battle conditions	Guesses he will stand up fairly well under battle conditions

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

THE TYPICALLY SUPERIOR
SPECIAL FORCES MAN

THE TYPICALLY INFERIOR
SPECIAL FORCES MAN

How He Rates Himself, Contd.

In 100 men of his own grade,
places himself in best 20
per cent or next to best
20 per cent

In 100 men of his own
grade, places himself
in middle 20 per cent

An examination of this profile shows the superior Special Forces man to be quite different from the stereotype held by many individuals in the Army, both in and out of Special Forces. Far from being the "Gung-Ho," glamor-seeking, cloak-and-dagger type, the ideal man emerges as a solid citizen. That he is mature and willing to accept responsibility is reflected by his marital status, insurance coverage, and attitude toward his job. The fact that he rates himself superior on many traits involves not so much modesty as honesty and perhaps a realistic view of his capabilities. His drinking habits and general social behavior are probably much like those of military people generally rather than confined to Special Forces. Clues to his interest in Special Forces include a reported fondness for geography and history in school, as well as indications that from an early age he could probably take care of himself.

F-Scale. This instrument was included as a partial test of the assumption that authoritarian attitudes were less likely to be found among the superior group than among the inferior group. A statistical analysis of the 30 F-Scale items identified seven items which satisfactorily distinguish between superior and inferior men. Two of the items are reproduced here as samples. Agreeing with these statements is in the direction of authoritarianism, and opposing them is in the direction of non-authoritarianism. In both these items the superior group tended to oppose the statement and the inferior group tended to agree with it.

Obedience and respect for authority are
the most important virtues children
should learn.

It is best to use some prewar authorities
in Germany to keep order and prevent
chaos.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Both of these statements reflect the symptoms of authoritarianism which are related to the need for obedience to a strong authority.

An additional analysis was made using the published scoring keys for the F-Scale. This analysis revealed a low relationship between scores computed from these keys and the Special Forces nominations scores.

Strong Vocational Interest Blank. Scores were calculated for the sample from six published SVIB scales, and each set of scores was statistically compared with the nominations scores to determine the degree of relationship that existed.* Of all six scales, only the one measuring the interests of Army officers in general showed a relationship with the nominations scores. Even this relationship was not large enough to warrant using the Army-officer key as a way of distinguishing between the high and low groups within Special Forces.

Even though the published scales that were tried generally did not distinguish well between the superior and inferior men, an item-by-item analysis indicated that 82 of the 400 SVIB items differentiated between the high and low men. As an example, here are some of the occupations liked and disliked by the superior group:

Occupations Liked

Aviator
Civil Engineer
Explorer
Foreign Correspondent
Criminal Lawyer

Occupations Disliked

Factory Worker
Jeweler
Office Clerk
Private Secretary
Typist

In general, the kinds of jobs which the superior group liked are those which involve initiative, physical activity, and new experiences. Routine, detailed, and indoor jobs were generally rejected by the superior group.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. A separate analysis for each of the 566 MMPI items indicated that 96 of them were useful in distinguishing between the high and low men. Differences between high and low men were

* See Appendix, Table 2 for relevant data.

CONFIDENTIAL

also found on seven of the published MMPI scales.* For the normal individual, a high scale score indicates a predisposition toward poor adjustment. Since part of the logic of the MMPI is that all mental deviation is but an exaggeration of the normal, high scale scores are by no means a sign that something is wrong. The comparisons on the MMPI were between the high and low groups in Special Forces and not between normals and deviates. Thus, as is true, both groups in Special Forces are normal and differ from each other within the range of normal responses.

With these facts in mind, tentative interpretations of the scale scores may be advanced. In general, the lower scores of the superior group are a consistent trend in the direction of indicating better adjustment to the environment. Two of the seven scores which showed differences (L and F) are checks on the truthfulness and conscientiousness with which the men filled out the MMPI. The higher scores of the inferior group on these scales may reflect a feeling that they wanted to present themselves in a good light, while no such need for distortion was present to the same degree in the high group.

Another of the differentiating scales (Hs) measures concern with illness and with real or imagined bodily symptoms. The superior group seemed less preoccupied with these matters than did the inferior group. Differences between the two groups on a scale that measures depression (D) may be traced to lower morale or more dissatisfactions on the part of the inferior men.

One of the discriminating scales (Pd) measures the degree to which an individual conforms with the customs and values of the social groups of which he is a part. The findings here may mean that the superior group is more willing to accept the restrictions and regulations imposed by the Army than is the inferior group.

Another of the discriminating scales (Pt) is in part a measure of compulsive behavior. In the adult, compulsion is sometimes manifested by a habitual, rigid way of doing things, by an excessive tidiness, and by adherence to a particular routine even though that may not be the best way to get the job done. The superior group shows less of this pattern than does the inferior group. In regimented societies, such as the Army, compulsive behavior is often rewarded. For example, some of the men who use every free minute to clean their equipment

* See Appendix, Table 3 for data upon which this discussion is based.

CONFIDENTIAL

and keep it neatly arranged are acting compulsively. A tentative interpretation of differences on this scale might be that men who are potential leaders exhibit fewer compulsive tendencies than do those with less initiative. To extend this interpretation, which is really a hypothesis, it might be conjectured that compulsive behavior is a way of getting along in the Army, but that to be judged superior, a man must exhibit traits which are unlike those associated with compulsive activity.

A-Scale. This instrument was concerned with measuring chronic fear reactions. Since the items in the A-Scale were all adapted from the MMPI, they were not analyzed separately. Each man was scored with the key which accompanies the A-Scale. The A-Scale did not distinguish between the high and low men in Special Forces. The tendency was for both the high and the low men to score low. Low scores are a sign of relatively few symptoms of chronic fear reactions. A possible conclusion from these data is that no man who volunteers for Special Forces, whether he turns out later to be good or bad, tends to suffer from chronic fear reactions. If he did, he might not be as likely to volunteer.

Sentence Completion test. As was noted earlier, the Sentence Completion test gave the subjects freedom to write what they wished instead of restricting them to selecting among alternatives. The other instruments administered had probed intensively into many areas; it was thought that the particular usefulness of the sentence completion technique would be in revealing clues to subtler ways of differentiating between the superior and inferior personnel than those found by other methods.

With this objective, processing of all the Sentence Completion blanks was not necessary. Instead, 58 were selected (30 superior, 28 inferior), representing the extremes of the high and low groups. These blanks were interpreted by a clinical psychologist.* The interpreter was given a list of topics and asked to evaluate the responses of the subjects with respect to them, as well as to note anything interesting outside the range of the suggested headings. He did not know which of the papers represented the high group and which the low group until after all the interpretations had been completed. It should be noted that these findings are the judgments of

* Dr. Charles N. Cofer, University of Maryland.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

one expert. Had the objective in using this test been different, it might be necessary to demonstrate agreement with these findings by other trained individuals.

The topics given the interpreter for evaluation were:

- (1) Social Adjustment. This area covers two important facets: (a) how well the individual will be able to work with a team and submerge his will to the common good and (b) how well he is judged to be able to work with foreign nationals.

A man was judged to be satisfactory in these respects when his record showed him to be relatively happy, unprejudiced, flexible in his attitudes, and sensitive to the needs and wishes of others. A man was judged unsatisfactory when the record revealed him to be immature, a "wise guy," color prejudiced, impatient of people with different ideas from his own, uncooperative, sullen, irritable, prissy, limited in ability and education, and lacking in sympathy for those who differ from himself.

73 per cent of the superior group and 60 per cent of the inferior group were judged to be able to work in a team.*
57 per cent of the superior group and 40 per cent of the inferior group were judged able to work with foreign nationals.

- (2) Prejudice-Authoritarianism.** This factor overlaps to some extent with social adjustment. Authoritarian attitudes were expressed in the following ways: impatience with those differing from oneself, impatience with inaction and discussion, expectation of conformity and obedience, brusqueness, use of others to serve own ends, willingness to punish others, and feelings of superiority.

A surprising finding, although not a definitive one because of the size of the sample, was the occurrence of greater authoritarianism in the superior than in the inferior group. This included both the expression of an authoritarian attitude toward others and conformity to

* It should be noted again that 58 men comprised the group used in the Sentence Completion analysis.

** An elaboration of the term authoritarianism may be found in the discussion of the F-Scale in Chapter 3.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

authoritarian figures and institutions. This finding, if later substantiated, would tend to refute a hypothesis of this study which has been upheld so far by the results of the F-Scale analysis: that the superior men are more free of authoritarian attitudes than are the inferior men. The chief prejudices seen were along color lines and in regard to moral issues; that is, looking unfavorably on those who had made mistakes in society. Willingness to be subservient to authoritarian institutions was observed.

33 per cent of the superior group and 25 per cent of the inferior group made statements indicating evidence of one or more of the above characteristics.

- (3) Dependability and Initiative. What is desired here is knowledge of the degree to which personnel may be expected to stay on the job at all costs and also to take over in leaderless situations.

87 per cent of the superior group and 64 per cent of the inferior group were judged to be dependable.

67 per cent of the superior group and 50 per cent of the inferior group were judged as likely to show initiative in leaderless situations.

63 per cent of the superior group and 47 per cent of the inferior group were judged to be both dependable and capable of showing initiative.

- (4) Sexual Attitudes and Adjustments. The problem was to determine whether the sexual attitudes of the individual are reasonably normal and like those of most of the group, or whether there are deviations of any identifiable kind. There was no attempt to predict unusual sex behavior - only unusual attitudes toward some aspect of sex. Unusual attitudes relative to sex were judged to be doubt as to one's sexual adequacy, possible latent homosexual interests, desire to avoid company of women, and desire to make criminal advances toward women.

Most of the men in both the superior and inferior groups were judged to have normal attitudes toward sex. Unsatisfactory attitudes which turned up included these: moral inhibitions, prudishness, hostility toward women, depreciation of women, excessive dependency on women, seeking for the ideal woman, inability to achieve intimacy with

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

women, latent homosexuality, uncertainty concerning adequacy in sexual matters, and protestations of being normal.

70 per cent of the superior group and 57 per cent of the inferior group were judged not to have unusual sex attitudes.

(5) Attitudes Toward Parents, Brothers and Sisters, Early Life. There seemed to be more findings related to attitudes toward parents than toward early life. This may be a function of the test itself or of the subjects. Indications of unsatisfactory attitudes in this area included the following: childhood remembered as pleasant but parents were resented, dominated by parents, misunderstood by parents, controlled by parents, rejected by father, father stern and harsh, father an authoritarian, spoiled by mother, hostility to brothers and sisters, strife and unhappiness in early life.

73 per cent of the superior group and 35 per cent of the inferior group were judged either as having favorable attitudes toward parents and early life or as revealing too little in the record to permit a judgment.

Summary. This section presented the findings of an expert's analysis of the Sentence Completion test blanks of some of the superior and inferior members in the 10th Special Forces Group. The analysis revealed attitudes and suggested types of behavior which help to characterize these individuals. The deviant and unsatisfactory attitudes should be investigated further when new personnel are chosen to participate in the testing program. Clues yielded here may be important in completing the picture of the successful Special Forces operator.

Special Forces Scoring Keys

If measurable patterns of personality traits, experiences, and interests exist which are unique for Special Forces, then there is a need for developing scoring keys different from the published keys which were developed on other groups. Special Forces scoring keys were constructed for three instruments for which published keys

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

were already available: F-Scale, SVIB, and MMPI.* A scoring key was also constructed for the Personal Data Form, for which there was none available.

A score was obtained for each man for each of the four Special Forces keys. These scores were then correlated with the nominations scores for each man to determine the degrees of relationship between the instruments and the nominations scores, and the instruments with each other.** The findings show a fair relationship between two of the instruments (F-Scale and MMPI) and the nominations, and a higher relationship between the other two (Personal Data Form and SVIB) and the nominations.

Discussion

The findings reported in this chapter constitute the first part of a research program which should eventuate in techniques that will aid in the screening of volunteers for Special Forces. These findings are the result of an investigation that was almost entirely exploratory. Hypotheses for this study were developed largely from tangentially related research and from interviews with men experienced in Special Forces type of operation, who differed widely in their opinions of the personal characteristics which contribute to success in this field.

Using this report and the technical appendices to it as points of departure, subsequent research can focus on those areas which were revealed as most promising for the development of selection techniques. Research effort should now be turned to corroborating the results of this investigation, testing assumptions which grew out of the present study, refining the criteria of effectiveness, probing for further explanations for the occurrence of some of the findings, and extending the inquiry to include other kinds of possible predictors of success in Special Forces.

* The keys developed for Special Forces are included in the technical appendices to this report, available on request from the Human Resources Research Office.

** See Appendix, Table 4, for the data upon which this discussion is based.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

REFERENCES

Agency Reports

Agency Management Association, New York City

1. Research Report No. 16 Handbook of Personnel Forms and Records (2nd ed.), by Eileen Ahern, 1949, 227 pp.
2. Research Report 1949-13 The Persistency Raters, 1949, 23 pp.
3. Research Report 1951-2 A Selection Study: The A 1-4-48 In Use, 1951, 16 pp.

Human Resources Research Center, Air Training Command,
Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas 1/

4. Research Bulletin 51-1 Prediction of Elimination From Basic Pilot Training for Reasons Other Than Flying Deficiency, by Ernest C. Tupes and John A. Cox, Feb 51, 25 pp.
5. Research Bulletin 51-2 Evaluation of a New Technique for Keying Biographical Inventories Empirically, by William B. Lecznar, Mar 51, 33 pp.
6. Research Bulletin 51-30 Characteristics of Instructors Who Intend To Stay in Their Assignments, by Arthur J. Hoehn, Dec. 51, 5 pp.
7. Research Bulletin 52-18 The Construction of Homogeneous Keys for A Biographical Inventory, by Philip H. DuBois et al.,

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Human Resources Research Institute, Air University,
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

8. Report No. 1 Survey of Psychological Warfare Personnel, Gowen Air Force Base, Idaho, 7,8,9 May 1952, Jun 52, 42 pp. (CONFIDENTIAL Security Information)

Institute for Research in Human Relations, Philadelphia, Pa.

9. Series 1952 - Institute Report No. 1 Leadership Identification and Acceptance, by Douglas Courtney et al. (annual technical report prepared for Office of Naval Research), Feb 52, 140 pp.

Life Insurance Sales Research Bureau, Hartford, Conn.

10. How Well Does the Aptitude Index Work, by Albert K. Kurtz, 1941, 74 pp.

Medical Research Laboratory, U.S. Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.

11. Report No. 211 The Interview: II. Aids to the Interview - The Confidential Questionnaire, by Frank J. McCabe et al. (contract research report prepared for Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy, by Fordham University, New York City), Oct 52, 60 pp.

Ohio State University Research Foundation, Columbus, Ohio

12. Final Report - 9 Factor Analysis of Officer Qualification Form QCL-2B, by Robert J. Wherry (contract research report prepared for Department of the Army), Feb 50, 31 pp.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Personnel Research Section, Personnel Research and Procedures Branch, Personnel Bureau, The Adjutant General's Office, Department of the Army 2/

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 13. Report 751 | <u>Preparation of a Biographical Information Blank for Integration of Warrant Officers</u> , Jan 48, 2 pp. |
| 14. Report 752 | <u>Procedures for Selection of Enlisted Man for Officer Training</u> , Feb 48, 22 pp. |
| 15. Report 757 | <u>Construction of West Point Self Description Blank - PRT 385</u> , Mar 48, 2 pp. |
| 16. Report 758 | <u>A Follow-up Validity Study of Instruments Developed for Selection of Recruiting Personnel</u> , Apr 48, 9 pp. |
| 17. Report 761 | <u>Construction of a Biographical Information Blank, Counterintelligence</u> , Aug 48, 5 pp. |
| 18. Report 762 | <u>Study of Operational ROTC Units to Identify Criterion and Predictor Variables (Military and Civil Colleges)</u> , Sep 48, 11 pp. |
| 19. Report 779 | <u>Construction of Personal Inventory for Arctic Assignment, PRT's 1642 and 1643</u> , Apr 49, 9 pp. |
| 20. Report 781 | <u>The Validity of Recruiter Selection Instruments at Various Points of Cut</u> , Apr 49, 4 pp. |
| 21. Report 782 | <u>Simplified Procedures for Evaluating the Records of Army Officers</u> , May 49, 13 pp. |
| 22. Report 788 | <u>Construction of an Evaluation Report for Warrant Officer Applicants</u> , Aug 49, 3 pp. |
| 23. Report 798 | <u>Classification Testing at Army Training Centers</u> , Sep 49, 10 pp. |

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

24. Report 810 Development of the Student Data Sheet for the Reporting of Army School Performance of Enlisted Personnel, Oct 49, 6 pp.
25. Report 829 Validation of the West Point Biographical Inventory WPB-1 Against First Year Aptitude for Service Ratings, Mar 50, 16 pp.
26. Report 865 The Army Personality Inventory, by G. Hamilton Crook et al., Jul 52, 10 pp.
27. Report 874 Psychological Requirements Analysis of Company Grade Officers: I. Survey of the Literature, by Jay L. Otis (contract research report prepared by Personnel Research Institute, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio), Dec 50, 120 pp.
28. Report 879 A Simplified-Vocabulary Revision of the Army Personality Inventory, by Walter H. Wilke and William D. Glenn, Jr. (contract research report prepared by New York University, New York City), Jan 51, 36 pp.
29. Report 924 Psychological Requirements Analysis of Company Grade Officers: A Methodological Study, by Jay L. Otis (contract research report prepared by Personnel Research Institute, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio), Jan 52, 189 pp.
30. Report 958 Validation of Three Objectively Scored Pictorial Tests of Personality for the Assessment of Leadership, by Raymond A. Kotzell et al. (contract research report prepared by Psychological Services Center, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.), May 52, 39 pp.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

31. Report 964

Validation of Personnel Measures Against Combat Performance of Enlisted Men in Korea: V. Non-test Variables In DA AGO Form 20, "Qualification Record - Enlisted Personnel", by Robert S. Tiemann et al., Jul 52, 9 pp.

32. Report 986

Research in the Army's Enlisted Leaders' Course Program, by Jack A. Parrish and June C. Loeffler, Dec 52, 10 pp.

33. Research Note
51-17

Construction of Preliminary Form of the ROTC Self Description Blank, Sep 50, 17 pp.

Research and Development Board, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C. 3/

34. Report HBM 200/1
Appendix 63

Selection of Personnel for Specialized Training and Duty, by Donald W. Fiske (prepared for the Working Group on Human Behavior Under Conditions of Military Service), Jun 51, 23 pp.

Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana

35.

The Potential Combat Officer - A Medicopsychological Study of Officer Candidates for the United States Marine Corps, by John H. Rohrer et al. (technical report prepared for Office of Naval Research), circa 1951, 77 pp.

U.S. Civil Service Commission, Examining and Placement Division, Washington, D. C.

36.

Research Project on Selection Methods for Overseas Employees, Aug 53, 95 pp.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Books

37. Adorno, T. W. et al., The Authoritarian Personality, Harper and Brothers, New York City, 1950, 990 pp.
38. Beaumont, Henry, The Psychology of Personnel, Longmans, Green, and Company, New York City, 1945, 306 pp.
39. Buros, Oscar K., The Third Mental Measurements Yearbook, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N. J., 1949, 1047 pp.
40. Burtt, Harold E., Principles of Employment Psychology (rev.), Harper and Brothers, New York City, 1942, 568 pp.
41. Burtt, Harold E., Applied Psychology, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York City, 1948, 821 pp.
42. Halsey, George D., Selecting and Inducting Employees, Harper and Brothers, New York City, 1951, 361 pp.
43. Harkins, Paul D. and Harkins, Philip, The Army Officer's Guide, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York City, 1951, 545 pp.
44. Hathaway, Starke R. and McKinley, J. C., Manual, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (rev. 1951), The Psychological Corporation, New York City, 1951, 31 pp.
45. Hathaway, Starke R. and Meehl, Paul E., An Atlas for the Clinical Use of the MMPI, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minn., 1951, 799 pp.
46. Lawshe, Charles H. Jr., Principles of Personnel Testing, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York City, 1948, 227 pp.
47. Moore, Herbert, Psychology for Business and Industry, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York City, 1942, 526 pp.
48. OSS Assessment Staff, Assessment of Men, Rinehart and Company, Inc., New York City, 1948, 541 pp.
49. Pigors, Paul and Myers, Charles A., Personnel Administration, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York City, 1947, 553 pp.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50. Scott, Walter D. et al., Personnel Management, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York City, 1941, 589 pp.
51. Stead, William H. and Shartle, Carroll L., Occupational Counseling Techniques, American Book Company, New York City, 1940, 273 pp.
52. Stouffer, S.A. et al., Studies in Social Psychology in World War II: Volume IV. Measurement and Prediction, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1950, 756 pp.
53. Strong, Edward K., Vocational Interests of Men and Women, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif., 1943, 746 pp.
54. Strong, Edward K., Manual for Vocational Interest Blank for Men, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif., 1951, 16 pp.
55. Thorndike, Robert L., Personnel Selection, J. Wiley, New York City, 1949, 358 pp.
56. Viteles, Morris S., Industrial Psychology, W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York City, 1932, 352 pp.
57. Viteles, Morris S., The Science of Work, W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York City, 1934, 442 pp.

Department of the Army Manuals and Regulations

58. Army Personnel Tests and Measurements, TM 12-260, Apr 53.
59. Military Clinical Psychology, TM 8-242, Jul 51.
60. Operations Against Guerilla Forces, FM 31-20, Feb 51 (CONFIDENTIAL).
61. Organization and Conduct of Guerilla Warfare, FM 31-21, Oct 51 (CONFIDENTIAL).
62. Volunteers for Special Forces Units, SR 600-160-10, Apr 52.

Forms

63. Alien Personal History Statement, USAFE Form 227.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

64. Biographical Information Blank, Counterintelligence, Booklet I, DA AGO PRT 853.
65. Biographical Information Blank, Counterintelligence, Booklet II, DA AGO PRT 855.
66. Officer's, Warrant Officer's, and Flight Officer's Qualification Record, WD ADO Form 66.
67. Personnel Data, OCS Form 401.
68. Qualification Record - Enlisted Personnel, DA AGO Form 2C
69. Self Description Blank, Booklet I, DA AGO PRT 1720.
70. Self Description Blank, Booklet II, DA AGO PRT 1719.

Journal Articles

71. Carter, L. F., "Leadership and Its Prediction From Several Levels of Performance", American Psychologist, Vol. 3, 1948, p. 270.
72. Carter, L. F., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Four Criteria of Leadership Ability for Three Different Tasks", Journal of Psychology, Vol. 27, 1949, pp. 245-261.
73. Carter, L. F. and Nixon, M., "Ability, Perceptual, Personality, and Interest Factors Associated With Different Criteria of Leadership", Journal of Psychology, Vol. 27, 1949, pp. 377-388.
74. Cowley, W. H., "Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 23, 1928, pp. 144-157.
75. Goldsmith, Dorothy, "The Use of Personnel History Blank as a Salesmanship Test", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 6, 1922, pp. 149-155.
76. Heineman, Charles E., "A Forced-Choice Form of the Taylor Anxiety Scale", Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 17, 1953, pp. 447-454.
77. Jenkins, John J., "Selection and Training of Aircraft Pilots", Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 5, 1941, p. 243.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

78. Jenson, M. B. and Rotter, J. B., "The Validity of the Multiple Choice Rorschach Test in Officer Candidate Selection", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 42, 1945, pp. 182-185.
79. Kohs, S. C. and Irle, K. W., "Prophecyng Army Promotion", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 4, 1920, pp. 73-87.
80. Lehman, H. C., "The Creative Years in Science and Literature", Scientific Monthly, Vol. 45, 1937, pp. 65-75.
81. Lehman, H. C., "Optimum Ages for Eminent Leadership", Scientific Monthly, Vol. 54, 1942, pp. 162-175.
82. Manson, Grace E., "What Can the Application Blank Tell", Journal of Personnel Research, Vol. 4, 1925-26, pp. 73-99.
83. Markey, Stanley C., "Opinions of Subordinate Enlisted Men as Measures of Supervisor Job Proficiency", American Psychologist, Vol. 3, 1948, p. 260.
84. Murray, H. A. and Stein, M., "Note on the Selection of Combat Officers", Psychosomatic Medicine, Vol. 5, 1943, pp. 386-391.
85. Page, D. P., "Measurement and Prediction of Leadership", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 41, 1935, pp. 31-43.
86. Page, H. E., "Detecting Potential Leaders", Journal of Aviation Medicine, Vol. 19, 1948, pp. 435-441.
87. Taylor, Janet A., "A Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 48, 1953, pp. 285-290.

Unpublished Sources

88. Cofer, C. N., "Summary of Findings, Sentence Completion" (consultant report on Task 60/5.3, GAMBIT, prepared for Psychological Warfare Research Division, Human Resources Research Office, 1954, unpublished material).
89. Holsopple, J. Q. and Miahle, Florence R., "The Projective Use of Incomplete Sentences", Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill. (in press).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

90. Human Resources Research Office, "Anxiety Scales for Use in Army Training Research", by Joseph Hammock (Staff Memorandum, Training Methods Division, March 1954).
91. Zuckerman, John V., "Interest Test Item Arrangement As It Affects Discrimination Among Professional Groups" (Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., 1951, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, based on research conducted by Stanford University under sponsorship of the Surgeon General, United States Army).

- 1/ Now Personnel and Training Research Center, Air Research and Development Command, Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas
- 2/ Now Personnel Research Branch, Personnel Research and Procedures Division, The Adjutant General's Office
- 3/ Now Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (R&D)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The credit for contributions of this research to the increased effectiveness of Special Forces units must be shared among many people. At the risk of omission, the author wishes to name those Army personnel whose cooperation, advice, and participation are remembered as especially important.

The following individuals at Fort Bragg, N. C., made arrangements for the collection of data, and offered suggestions for increasing the value of the research to Special Forces: Col. C. H. Karlstad and Col. Gordon Singles, former commandants of the Psychological Warfare Center; Col. Aaron Bank, Commanding Officer, 10th Special Forces Group; Lt. Col. John T. Shannon, Executive Officer, 77th Special Forces Group; Maj. Oscar Suchier, S-3, 10th Special Forces Group.

Contributions to designing the study, evaluating the results, and critiquing portions of the report were made by the following individuals in the Office of the Chief of Psychological Warfare, Department of the Army: Col. William J. Blythe, Col. Bradford Butler, Lt. Col. Robert S. Stafford, Lt. Col. Martin F. Sullivan, and Lt. Col. Martin J. Waters, Jr.

Above all, the Research Staff is indebted to the officers and men of the 10th Special Forces Group without whose enthusiastic participation in the nominating and testing sessions the study could not have been completed.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Table 1

Pearson r correlation coefficients for each criterion item with each other criterion item.*

<u>Skill</u>	<u>Dependability</u>	<u>Initiative</u>	<u>Patience</u>	<u>Representativeness</u>
Ski.	.732	.840	.805	.810
Dep.		.858	.890	.810
Ini.			.831	.807
Pat.				.796
R p.				

* N=157. Excluded were (1) individuals with no votes in one or more of the categories, (2) individuals who did not participate in the testing program.

CONFIDENTIAL

Table 2

Pearson r correlation coefficients for six
Strong scales with the nominations scores.*

<u>Strong Scale</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
	<u>Coefficient</u>
Army Officer	.238**
Aviator	.157
Occupational Level	.148
Specialization Level	.079
Masculinity - Femininity	.141
Interest Maturity	.104

* Based on 178 cases. Excluded were subjects whose papers contained 10% or more blank or unscorable responses. When all 215 cases were used, the correlations were somewhat higher.

** Significant at the .01 level.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 52 -

Table 3
Means, standard deviations, and critical ratios for the differences between means of the high and low criterion groups, based on MMPI scales.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>High group +</u>		<u>Low group +</u>		<u>Critical Ratio</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	
Lie Scale	3.62	1.99	4.38	2.43	2.45*
F Scale	4.03	2.56	5.81	3.97	3.81*
K Scale	15.35	4.29	14.31	5.01	1.61**
Hypochondriasis (Hs)	10.44	2.74	11.82	3.89	2.96*
Depression (D)	16.02	3.58	19.00	4.52	3.51*
Hysteria (Hy)	16.81	3.78	17.40	4.30	1.05
Psychopathic Deviate (Pd)	22.15	3.78	23.79	4.08	3.03*
Masculine-Feminine (Mf)	20.47	4.62	20.42	4.70	0.03**
Paranoia (Pa)	8.19	2.98	8.90	3.01	1.71
Psychastenia (Pt)	22.76	4.27	25.42	6.07	3.63*
Schizophrenia (Sc)	24.00	4.81	27.02	6.89	3.64*
Hypomania (Ma)	21.83	3.78	22.49	4.26	1.18
Social I. E. (Si)	21.56	7.52	23.49	9.21	1.65

+ High group, N-119; Low group, N-96

* The probability is less than 1 in 100 that a critical ratio of this size or larger could occur by chance. (C. R. of 2.32 is significant at the .01 level with 213 degrees of freedom)

** Mean of the high group higher than the mean of the low group. In all other cases, the mean of the low group was higher.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Table 4

Pearson r correlation coefficients of each score
with every other score and with the criterion.*

	<u>1**</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
1		-.126	.144	.309	.212	.265	-.015	.148
2			.635	.405	.280	.519	-.135	.238
3				.677	.585	.728	-.134	.512
4					.585	.574	-.242	.330
5						.494	-.064	.392
6							-.053	.517
7								.030
8								

* N=178. Excluded were individuals any of whose test papers contained 10% or more blank or unscorable responses. When all 215 papers were used, the r's were generally somewhat higher. With this N, an r of .159 or larger is significant at the .05 level, an r of .208 or larger is significant at the .01 level.

** Key to matrix:

- 1 The occupational level key for the Strong
- 2 The Army officer key for the Strong
- 3 The Special Forces key for the Strong
- 4 The Special Forces key for the MMPI
- 5 The Special Forces key for the F-Scale
- 6 The Special Forces key for the Personal Data Form
- 7 The Army key for the forced choice form of the A-Scale
- 8 The criterion (nominations) scores

CONFIDENTIAL

DISTRIBUTION LIMITATIONS ON THE ENCLOSED AD DOCUMENTS
HAVE BEEN REMOVED, AUTHORITY:
DOD DIR. 5200.20 dated 29 MARCH 1965.